

TR-7325

Executive Registry

22-1438/1
29 MAR 72

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

THROUGH : *[initials]* Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Senior Seminar

REFERENCE : Memo, 10 Mar 72 from: Ex.Dir.-Comp.
to A/DTR, same subject

1. We very much appreciate receiving your suggestions on the Senior Seminar as set forth in the reference and your interest in the Senior Seminar. Some of the items on the list are being met during the current Seminar or will be in future runnings; a few are more complex and strike me as warranting further discussion. I have taken the liberty of quoting each point in the reference and following it with our comments.

a. "In Block II, I find no particular coverage of Europe. It seems to me that the European Community is an important economic and political unit well worth special attention."

OK
Comment: Concur. The Seminar Staff made an effort to include coverage of Europe and the European Community. They first contacted Robert Bowie, Director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, who declined on the basis of a busy schedule. They then invited Professor Klaus Knorr of Princeton who is an ONE consultant and had been recommended by several ONE Staff members. Dr. Knorr declined on the basis that he felt he is not particularly competent to cover the subject. The Seminar Staff will try harder next time.

b. "Is Block II really worth two whole weeks? Granted, it needs coverage and could not be handled in one week. I just wonder at the investment involved in two whole weeks for general updating which will be out of date in a matter of months."

Comment: This is a tough question. The Staff argues that coverage of "Major World Trends and Problems" is worth at least two weeks or probably not worth covering at all. They recognize that the coverage of the different topics in the Block is at best pretty thin. The rationale for this Block

-2-

b. Comment (contd)

is to expose the participants to changes in the thinking and interpretation of U.S. foreign policy and equities and in the Agency's target areas which have occurred since the participants finished their formal education. The exposure to independent and reputable outside views provides a yardstick against which to measure Agency views and stereotypes, as well as a tremendous source of stimulation which carries through the entire Seminar. The material also ties in with and provides an appropriate background on the work of the Agency and the Intelligence Community. Personally, I believe this question probably deserves further exploration.

OK →
c. "I commend your use of movies on a voluntary basis. I suggest, however, you might put them onto free time or even evening time and increase the number. There are a lot of good movies that would be worthwhile seeing but are not worth taking up class time during the day."

Comment: Concur with your suggestions on films. At present, a total of 14 are scheduled of which 7 will be run on an optional basis during the lunch period. The Staff is currently exploring the showing of additional films and the interest in evening sessions with films.

25X1A

d. "Perhaps [redacted] talk might cover it, but I would suggest a nuts-and-bolts discussion of our relations

25X1C

e. "The Defense day seems a little spotty. Rather than discussing Defense policy and R&D, I wonder if we should not discuss how intelligence can help Defense and how CIA and DOD can and should collaborate on operational as well as policy problems."

-3-

e. contd.

You are probably right

Comment: Your suggestion that the "Day at the Pentagon," when the participants are scheduled to hear Mr. Barrody, Dr. Foster, Admiral Moorer and Dr. Hall, include coverage of how intelligence can help Defense is well taken. The coverage of topics by these speakers is being shifted to focus on this question. Your thought that the Defense speakers should explore how Defense and CIA should collaborate on operational and policy problems does not, however, strike me as being entirely appropriate for airing in a training program. We may be a little sensitive, but I would anticipate that Agency managers who have responsibility on our end for such problems would greatly prefer that the Seminar avoid these subjects.

You are probably right

f. "How useful is the USIA presentation" I would think we might get at least as much or more out of AID. This could cover some of the fairly large ideas of reorganization of our foreign aid."

25X1A

✓

Comment: As [redacted] mentioned to you, the USIA presentation is scheduled primarily in order to hear Mr. Shakespeare and his point of view. The Seminar heard an excellent presentation on 21 March on the subject of the problems of developing countries and AID's role from Mr. James Fowler, Special Assistant to the Deputy Administrator. His comments included some ideas on how our foreign assistance program might best be organized and related to U.S. foreign policy objectives.

25X1C

✓



h. "I would think that the NSC presentation is much more important than a single speech by General Haig. I suggest a working-level NSC staff member or even panel to tell us what they expect from CIA and how we can help them better."

REF ID: A6521

- 4 -

h. contd.

*Copy
Secty*

Comment: General Haig is talking on how the NSC functions on 24 April. In your reading of the schedules, you apparently overlooked the presentation by Mr. Sonnenfeldt of the NSC Staff on 31 March which will get into the question of how the Agency supports the NSC.

i. "Is there a way to cover the organizational aspects of NRO without getting into impossible security compartmentalization problems?"

Comment: The organizational side of the NRO will be covered by Mr. Brownman on 11 April. The participants hold the necessary clearances.

j. "I found no particular discussion of the art of analysis. In particular, I would think some imaginative discussion of future changes in analysis, techniques to meet new demands of volume and precision would be appropriate. This could include a good exposure to how Automated Data Processing could help us more."

25X1A

Thanks

Comment: The subject of intelligence analysis in the Intelligence Directorate will be covered by a panel on 10 April and the estimative process by [redacted], Deputy Director of National Estimates, on 14 April. Having noted this, I doubt that these presentations will provide the kind of coverage raised in your suggestion. This is an area that warrants further exploration, discussion and attention.

Thanks

k. "Similarly, I suggest a somewhat more operational look at the production process, i.e., the identification and transmission of requirements, evaluations of our products, discussions of the present and possibly changed formats of our finished production and the tangled subject of information processing and retrieval."

Comment: Same comment as on item j.

- 5 -

2. If the above comments are not sufficiently responsive please let us know and we will take appropriate action. Otherwise, I recommend that the knottier questions (a, j and K) be discussed when the Seminar is completed as part of a general look at the lessons learned in running the first two Seminars.

7
Thanks

[Redacted]

Acting Director of Training

25X1A

SAC

SENIOR SEMINAR

1. Many ideas from Mr. Cunningham as DTR. One was the Senior Seminar. Proposed November 1970 ^{OTR} to run a course for senior officers, GS-15 and above, on par with senior government courses--NWC, SS in FP, FEI--taking best of different approaches, adapting to CIA. ^(Ex. de. Ag. : c o m p a r a t i v e .) Why? CIA has sent its people to these courses--more applicants than places--but none focused sufficiently on intelligence or CIA's interests. Had programs for junior officers, mid-career officers, not an executive course. Proposal approved by DCI for one running trial basis, to be given hard evaluation.

2. Hugh recruited me to organize the program. Joined OTR late December 1970.

3. First task was a thorough analysis of senior officer population of CIA. What is this group like? What kind of experience? Education? Mobility within CIA? Training? Developed a profile.

4. Next, took a look at other programs--NWC, SS in FP, ICAF, FEI, etc. Developed a tentative model. Then consulted widely in the Agency on a) model and b) objectives. Rounds of consultations, redefined and refined both model and objectives.

5. Based on study of senior officer population and consultations, three objectives were set forth:

a. Objective 1. To enable Seminar participants to develop greater insight into problems and pressures facing CIA management, the processes of change within the Agency and in its external relationships, and developments in American society which are relevant to CIA as an organization.

b. Objective 2. To acquaint Seminar participants with current thinking on foreign policy equities and those developments abroad which are the intelligence collection, analysis and covert action targets of CIA.

c. Objective 3. To provide an opportunity for senior officers to refresh and broaden their insights as managers and their understanding of others in the Agency with whom they work or have contact.

6. Model--and this has varied through the runnings and I will come back to what the Seminar covers and how it does it.

7. First running--September-November 1971, the second from March-May 1972 and the third from January-March 1973 (just finished yesterday). Lasts about nine weeks. Last summer, the question of what to do with the Senior Seminar was considered by Mr. Colby and deputies. First it was decided to run it once a year for 30-35 officers. Decision was reconsidered and in September decision made to run it twice a year, for the smaller number.

25X1A

8. What is covered by the Seminar? First week, [] is multifaceted: Management skills, orientation, overall looks at the Agency. Recent running, second two weeks on CIA's business--you have had session in OSP control center for each running; this time a week on "New Methodologies"; two weeks on changing international scene and new world trends; a week on CIA's official environment, our relationships with the rest of government; a week on domestic change and problems of relevance to CIA; and concluding week on the way CIA is managed.

9. How do we do it? Single most used format is the guest speaker or panel, who talks to a subject and then is followed by a question and answer session. Use guest speakers from throughout

CIA, other government officials, and experts from universities, think tanks, and private activity. Tailor this by use of scope notes. Increasingly, we are going to case studies and games developed by members of the staff; great success. Use films quite a bit. Real difference is our use of the resource of experience among the Seminar members themselves. This last running, over 350 years experience in CIA around the table. We tap this variety in different ways; one is the member presentation worked out in advance with members. Hour and quarter talk and exchange. Also through discussion groups, questions, comments and so on.

10. Other features:

- a. Extensively cleared (SI, TKH, [redacted] I) 25X1A
- b. Spend great deal of time on evaluation; both individual activities in terms of effectiveness for learning and overall critique. Done by members.

11. Wind up by saying results of evaluations have been high, in terms of what members believe they have learned and how Agency has profited from their exposure and their broadening. We plan to review with members what value has been to them and Agency after 100 (five runnings) have been complete.

Cost per running (exclusive staff salaries) about \$10K if no trip.

12. One last word on staffing. No TO. Borrowed and rotated. One from S&T for first two runnings; one from DDP-DD for first and another for second and third; a CT on interim; one ST now with FAE; one ST from SIWA; and myself on loan from S career service.

13. Good program. Challenge is to update, renew, revitalize by addition of new materials, new speakers, additional case studies.